

Hiltner, Allison

From: Kathy Godtfredsen <KathyG@windwardenv.com>
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2013 4:27 PM
To: Philip M Gschwend; (b) (6)
Cc: Hiltner, Allison; Wakeman, John S NWS; Michalsen, Mandy M NWS; Suzanne Replinger; Nancy Judd; Duncan, Bruce; Allison Crowley; Anne Fitzpatrick (anne.fitzpatrick@aecon.com); Dave Schuchardt (Dave.Schuchardt@Seattle.Gov); Debra Williston (b) (6); Debra Williston (debra.williston@kingcounty.gov); Doug Hotchkiss (hotchkiss.d@portseattle.org); Jeff Stern (jeff.stern@kingcounty.gov); Kathy Godtfredsen; Kym Takasaki (Takasaki.K@portseattle.org); mccronel@exponent.com; michael.j.gleason@boeing.com; Mike Johns; Reid Carscadden (rcarscadden@integral-corp.com); Rick Bodishbaugh; Skip Fox (skip.fox@boeing.com)
Subject: Food web model for the Lower Duwamish Waterway
Attachments: A&G_model_best-fit parameter set_FINAL_Selected_model.xls

Hi Phil – Please find attached the food web model (FWM) for the Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW). This attachment along with the information in Appendix D of the remedial investigation (RI) should provide you with a good start on the modeling you'd like to do in the LDW. We look forward to seeing the data you've collected in the sediment and water as part of the study, and would be happy to answer any questions that come up regarding assumptions in the model, etc.

As a side note, after the finalization of the LDW RI, we recently discovered an error in the calibrated value for the English sole porewater ventilation rate that was used in the FWM. The distribution set for this value in the calibration was supposed to be a triangular distribution from 0.005 to 0.02 with a mean value of 0.01 (Table D.4-1 of Appendix D of the LDW RI). However, the calibrated value that was used in the FWM (0.146) was outside of this range. Note that the value reported in Appendix D was a rounded value (0.1), but as you will see, the values used in the FWM were not rounded. Fortunately, the FWM is not very sensitive to this parameter. The current species predictive accuracy factor (SPAF) for English sole is 1.08 (using the porewater ventilation rate of 0.146). If the porewater ventilation rate is changed to 0.01 (i.e., within the correct calibration range), the SPAF actually gets a little better, and is reduced to 1.01. We thought you might find this tidbit useful, particularly in light of your focus on porewater.

Good luck with your research. We look forward to hearing from you!

Kathy Godtfredsen, PhD
Windward Environmental, Partner
200 W Mercer St, Suite 401
Seattle, WA 98119
206.577.1283
kathyg@windwardenv.com

The information contained in this e-mail message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and as such is privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the recipient named above or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, the reader is hereby notified that this message has been received in error and that any review, dissemination, copying or distribution of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately, and delete this message.